## For the Northern District of California

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARCUS L. HARRISON,

No. C 07-959 SI (pr)

Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING DISCOVERY MOTION

v.

Officer J. SAMPLE; et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff's motion for discovery is DENIED because the court does not conduct discovery on behalf of litigants and court permission is not required for plaintiff to conduct his own discovery. (Docket # 7.)

The court generally is not involved in the discovery process and only becomes involved when there is a dispute between the parties about discovery responses. Discovery requests and responses normally are exchanged between the parties without any copy sent to the court. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d) (listing discovery requests and responses that "must not" be filed with the court until they are used in the proceeding or the court orders otherwise). Only when the parties have a discovery dispute that they cannot resolve among themselves should the parties even consider asking the court to intervene in the discovery process. The court does not have enough time or resources to oversee all discovery, and therefore requires that the parties present to it only their very specific disagreements. To promote the goal of addressing only very specific disagreements (rather than becoming an overseer of all discovery), the court requires that the parties meet and confer to try to resolve their disagreements before seeking court intervention.

## Case 3:07-cv-00959-SI Document 9 Filed 05/18/07 Page 2 of 2

See Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(2)(B); N. D. Cal. Local Rule 37. Where, as here, one of the parties is a prisoner, the court does not require in-person meetings and instead allows the prisoner and defense counsel to meet and confer by telephone or exchange of letters. Although the format of the meet-and-confer process changes, the substance of the rule remains the same: the parties must engage in a good faith effort to meet and confer before seeking court intervention in any discovery dispute.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 18, 2007

SUSAN ILLSTON United States District Judge